DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 060 888 LI 003 556

AUTHOR Schulzetenberg, Anthony C.
TITLE An Evaluation of the Closed Reserve at St. Cloud State College: A Follow-up Study.
INSTITUTION Saint Cloud State Coll., Minn.
PUB DATE May 68
NOTE 50p.;(18 References) Prepared in the Department of Library and Audiovisual Education

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *College Libraries; Cost Effectiveness; Evaluation; Followup Studies; *Library Collections; Library Programs; Library Surveys; *Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS *Reserve Book Collections

ABSTRACT

An evaluation of the reserve book collection at St. Cloud State College library was conducted during 1960 with the results reported in July 1961. (This earlier study is LI 003 557). The present report is a followup study to that first evaluation. Improved faculty orientation to the reserve collection, based on the findings of the 1960 survey, resulted in increased use of the reserve collection. This second evaluation concludes that despite increased usage, the present reserve system should be discontinued. Prohibitive operational costs, if directed instead toward alleviating the pressure on items in the general collection, would provide not only improved service for required class readings, but also improved service to the general clientele in placing fewer restrictions on materials. The closed reserve system could be discontinued by eliminating the unused or little used material, provide enough material to meet the demands on reserve holdings, or expanded reading lists for students. (Author/SJ)

ED 060888

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AN EVALUATION OF THE CLOSED RESERVE AT ST. CLOUD STATE COLLEGE: A FOLLOW-UP STUDY

Anthony C. Schulzetenberg

Department of Library & Audiovisual Education
School of Education
St. Cloud State College
St. Cloud, Minnesota

May, 1968

LI 003 556

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	The Problem	6
	The Hypothesis	6
II.	ST. CLOUD STATE COLLEGE	7
	The Academic Community	7
	The Library	9
III.	SURVEY OF THE RESERVE SYSTEM	12
	The Instructor and the Reserve System	13
	Student Use of Reserve	21
	Cost Analysis of Reserve	31
IV.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	35
BIBLIOGRAPHY		40
APPENDIX		43
	A. Facsimile of a Reserve List	44
	B. Facsimile of a Reserve List	45
	C. Man-Hours for Reserve Procedure Determined by Sample Lists	46
	D. Costs for Materials and Labor	47

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Relation of Faculty, Reserve Lists, and First-Year Users	15
II.	Relation of Instructor, Number of Students, Number of Titles on Reserve, Number of Copies on Reserve, and Number of Titles not Used on Reserve Lists of Over Twenty Titles for Fall Quarter, 1966	18
III.	Relation of Instructor, Number of Students, Number of Titles on Reserve, Number of Copies on Reserve, and Number of Titles not Used on Reserve Lists of Over Twenty Titles for Fall Quarter, 1967	19
IV.	Relationship of Reserve Requests by School as Compared to the Number of Students Versus the Number of Titles and Copies	20
V.	Comparison of Morning, Afternoon, and Evening Reserve Charges, Fall Quarter, 1966	22
VI.	Schedule of Float Hours at St. Cloud State College	23
VII.	Summary of Reserve Usage	25
VIII.	Comparison by Course of All Charges Over 100, Fall Quarter, 1966	28
IX.	Comparison by Course of All Charges Over 100, Spring Quarter, 1967	29
X.	Comparison by Course of All Charges Over 100, Fall Quarter, 1967	30
XI.	Man-Hour Cost per Quarter	32
XII.	Supply Cost per Quarter	33

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

When an academic library finds itself vitally concerned about whether its reserve collection is being used effectively, or whether it should in fact exist at all, the library can under no circumstance feel that it has encountered an unique nor new problem. Although not a great deal of literature has been published concerning reserve use in the last seven years, there is enough evidence to indicate that librarians and educators are concerned about the reserve problem. As far back as 1959, Henry Wriston wrote that his battle against the reserve shelf, insofar as its adverse effect on broader use of the library is concerned, had already been waged for thirty years.[1]

We have not waged a war on the reserve collection at St. Cloud State, nor have we been as concerned about its adverse effects for as many years as has Wriston. This is not to say, however, that our feelings about efficient usage are any less intense or that we have lived in a state of vacuum during the last number of years regarding possible improvements.

The original survey and subsequent attempts to improve reserve usage and the reserve system were begun during the fall quarter of 1960. The conclusion drawn by Mr. Harold Opgrand, then reserve librarian at Kiehle Library, indicated shortcomings

---

[1]Guy R. Lyle, The President, the Professor, and the College Librarian, (New York: H.W. Wilson Company, 1963), p. 57.

on the part of both the college faculty and the library staff. The conclusions indicated that the faculty at St. Cloud State did not practice sagacious selection of reserve materials nor did the library staff communicate effectively with the faculty in educating them as to the principles of judicious selection and use of these materials.

Self-evaluation in itself cannot be successful unless the results thereof be put to some practical use, either to correct a problem or to improve existing conditions. Lest the library staff be accused of inertia after discovery of the problems pointed out in the original study, it should be noted that an emphasis was placed on developing improved reserve usage. Steps were taken to prevent subsequent bad reserve practices and to establish a better means of communication with the college faculty. As Lyle pointed out, and as was subsequently stated by Opgrand, "The reserve book system touches the work of the professors so closely . . . the reserve librarian must possess sufficient poise and self-confidence to meet the faculty and to discuss their reserve needs . . . ."[2] Whether or not this is possible on a direct contact basis is a matter of staff involvement and staff size; however, it did re-enforce the philosophy that some form of contact, either direct or indirect, was essential. As the first step in the communication process, a program of faculty education in the selection of reserve materials was begun.

---

[2]Guy R. Lyle, The Administration of the College Library (New York: H.W. Wilson Company, 1945), p. 156; Harold J. Opgrand, An Evaluation of the Closed Reserve at St. Cloud State College Library. Unpublished starred paper, the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1960.

Obviously, it was based on better and expanded communication.

The first step was to make the Learning Resources Committee aware of Opgrand's study so that a program of action could be initiated. After examination of the survey results by that group, the following plan of activities was initiated:

1) The Library Committee was to meet with division chairmen to make results of the survey known to them so that they in turn would be able to stress good reserve practices at divisional meetings.

2) The reserve librarian was to meet individually with those faculty members who undoubtedly misunderstood the purpose of the reserve shelf at the time a list was submitted.

3) The reserve librarian was to establish a sound system of recording reserve use and these statistics would subsequently be made available to staff members through appropriate meetings with individual faculty members.

4) The division chairmen were to meet with individual faculty members to re-enforce contacts made by the reserve librarian and to insure proper interpretation of statistics.

5) An orientation on reserve use was to be presented to all new faculty members during the days of orientation preceding the first week of the new school year.

6) The purchase of additional copies of key books was to be considered to provide for broader general use and a cut-down of reserve materials.[3]

There were two principles underlying the entire plan. These were pointed out by Opgrand in his study and attributed to Lansberg and Beach respectively--that it was mandatory for the librarian and professor to work together to evolve a program and that the reserve collection was to be more than a storehouse for books.[4] It was the concensus of opinion among the committee

---

[3]Interview with Dr. Luther Brown, Director, Bureau of Learning Resources, St. Cloud State College, January 19, 1967.

[4]Opgrand, op. cit., p. 2.

members that if the proposed program were carried out and guided by these principles, it would be well worth the effort of continuing the reserve collection and it might well be developed into a collection that was both alive and active. There was little doubt in their minds that the reserve system had great potential.[5]

Much of the same philosophy that existed at the time of Opgrand's study about the value of the reserve system still exists today. Several articles have, however, been published since then that seem to support the Wriston philosophy that the reserve system be eliminated. Benjamin Smith makes the following observation:

> The development of the thinking abilities and habits essential for living creatively and responsibility in the modern world cannot be accomplished by a 'package theory' of classroom instruction wherein students are 'spoon fed' with assigned readings and lectures.[6]

E. J. Josey is even more critical of the system when he points out the professors abuse of the system:

> There are hundreds of excellent books that may be suggested to students for collateral reading in their courses, but these scholars prefer to assign three or four of the same readings year after year to large numbers of students in their courses . . . . If the librarian points out the futility of such assignments, our unconcerned professors are quick to reply that these three or four readings, so very often three or four chapters, are the best for their students.[7]

Leontine D. Carroll pointed out that students really aren't

---

[5]Brown, loc. cit.

[6]Benjamin F. Smith, "The Book Reserve System," Improving College and University Teaching, XII (Spring, 1964), p. 86.

[7]E. J. Josey, "The Absent Professors," Library Journal, LXXXVII (January, 1962), p. 174.

required to use the library to attain present educational objectives. He states:

> Many or perhaps most college students never discover the attributes of the library because they are able to complete their courses by following a debilitating plan . . . . This is reinforced by reserve collections which can be used frequently without the students' even learning the title of a work.[8]

The plan proposed after Opgrand's study has now been in operation for seven years, and prior to this survey, no subsequent survey was made. From the standpoint of empirical observation, it would seem that the reserve collection at St. Cloud State is well-used. Reserve lists are generally brief and seem to consist of well-chosen materials, the reading room is often crowded with users and the students on checkout duty seem to be busy. Since the proof of the pudding lies in the eating, we cannot rely on this type of observation as a criterion for judging the effectiveness of the collection. Even though the plans for effective operation were quite well laid, this does not indicate the extent of use. Robert Burns expressed this quite clearly in his verse about the best-laid plans of mice and men.

Frequent evaluation is necessary to discover how effective plans are when put into operation. Donald Coney, who was librarian at the University of Texas when Theodore W. Koch made his appraisal of reserve book systems, wrote in his letter to the latter that ". . . a reserve collection needs continual, critical observation to keep it within bounds."[9]

---

[8]Leontine D. Carroll, "Students Don't Need the Library," Improving College and University Teaching, XII (Spring, 1964), p. 81.

[9]American Library Association, College and University Library Service (Chicago: American Library Association, 1938), p. 94.

If we are to heed the obvious message in the cliche that there is indeed a difference between ten years of experience and ten years of the same experience, then we must resist the impulse not to self-evaluate, for it is generally easier to resist change than it is to institute change. If we are not to fall into the doldrums of complacency, then we must subscribe to Coney's statement that critical and continued observation is necessary. It is for this reason that this study was carried out.

I. THE PROBLEM

The problem in this study is concerned with the use of the closed reserve collection at St. Cloud State College.

II. HYPOTHESES

Improved faculty orientation to the reserve collection, based on findings of a survey conducted during the fall quarter, 1960, has resulted in increased use of the reserve collection at St. Cloud State College. Despite increased usage, the reserve system as it now exists should be discontinued. Prohibitive operational costs, if directed instead toward alleviating the pressure on items in the general collection, would provide not only improved service for required class readings, but also improved service to the general clientele in placing fewer restrictions on materials.

CHAPTER II

ST. CLOUD STATE COLLEGE

More than seven years have passed since Opgrand completed his research on the reserve system at St. Cloud State. The college has seen many changes in those years and, as is typical of most colleges, need has been the underlying factor in change. As in most cases where rate of growth proceeds more quickly than the anticipated rate, need has sometimes created havoc, especially insofar as physical facilities and resources are concerned. A brief background of both the academic community and the library are given here to make the reader aware of changes since the original study. What effect these factors may have had or will have on reserve use is difficult to determine, but these facts are presented here so that the reader may draw his own conclusions.

I. THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

The academic community has changed considerably since 1960. In spite of these changes, the college still functions as a teacher training institution in elementary and secondary education.[10] It is generally accepted that there has been a trend toward liberal arts education, and the addition of a four-year liberal arts curriculum and the bachelor of arts degree in 1946 initiated this trend. Since that time, the addition of pre-professional study

---

[10]"College Profile," (St. Cloud State: Information Services, 1967), p. 4.

areas has reduced the percentage of people training to become teachers. Today the college offers some fifty majors and minors for four-year degrees and fourteen fields are open for pre-professional study.[11] In addition, Master of Science degrees, the Master of Business Administration degree, and Master of Arts degrees have been added.[12] Some of these degrees were already offered in 1960, but most have been expanded to include additional fields.

Reorganizations within the past seven years have changed both the academic and administrative organization of the college. In 1960 the college was divided into eight instructional divisions--Arts and Music, Business, Education, Health and Physical Education, Language and Literature, Mathematics and Science, Psychology, and Social Sciences. In 1964 the college was reorganized into four academic areas which were made schools instead of divisions. These are the School of Education, the School of Business, the School of Arts & Sciences, and the Institute of Industrial Education and Technology. The 1967-68 school year saw an organizational change whereby the administrative unit was divided into four major areas, each headed by a vice president. These areas are Academic Affairs, Administrative Affairs, Student Affairs, and Development and Institutional Relations.

The college has maintained its accreditation by the North Central Association of College and Secondary Schools and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.[13]

---

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid.

[13] St. Cloud State College General Bulletin, 1967-69 (St. Cloud: St. Cloud State, 1967), p. 1.

Both of these agencies were present on campus during the 1966-67 school year for a re-evaluation of the academic program.

Curricula changes since 1960 are evident through a comparison of bulletins for various years. The greatest changes in the academic community, however, have come about in other areas because of increased enrollment. Whereas 190 faculty members taught about 3,000 students at the time of the original study, 412 full-time faculty members and some 7,500 students used the multi-million dollar facilities of the college during the 1966-67 school year.[14] An increase in student enrollment of about one thousand students occurred during the fall quarter, 1967.

During the ninety-nine years of its existence, the college has grown steadily, so that along with its growing pains, it is today the third largest college in Minnesota. This rapid growth has placed a great burden on existing facilities, and nowhere is this more evident than in the building that houses the library.

II. THE LIBRARY

The aims and objectives of the library remain unchanged in that they are still analagous to the aims and objectives of the college. It has, however, changed administratively and physically. It is today a part of the Bureau of Learning Resources. The Bureau is comprised of five divisions; namely, Technical Services,

---

[14]"College Profile" (St. Cloud: Information Services, 1967), p. 4.

Public Services, Audiovisual Services, Campus Laboratory Instructional Materials Center, and General Services. Four of these functions are carried out in the Kiehle building, with only the laboratory school center housed in another building.

Physical facilities are being taxed to the limit with the addition of materials and personnel, and with the influx of students. The building that was built in 1952 to serve 2,000 students must today provide for some 8,500 students. That the building is overcrowded is an understatement, but the completion of a new building within the next two years should relieve the problem somewhat.

The materials collection has been expanded to include over 165,000 volumes, and the addition of some 40,000 volumes during the present year will increase both its quality and quantity. Rapidly expanding files of pamphlets and ephemeral materials are housed in the curriculum laboratory. A growing children's collection complements the collection of curriculum guides and sample textbooks in this area. The periodical subscription list has nearly tripled since 1960 with over 1,500 subscriptions being maintained today. Back issues are generally bound and a serious effort is being made to complete selected back issue files with reprints and microfilm.[15]

It matters little that a college library houses adequate materials unless these are readily available to the user. In this respect the library fully subscribes to that section of the Standards for College Libraries which states:

---

[15]"Summary Report to the President" (St. Cloud: Instructional Resources, 1967), p. 1. (Multilithed.)

> The library's collection of books, periodicals, pamphlets, documents, newspapers, maps, microfilm, microcards, microprint, and other materials, must be so constituted and organized as to give effective strength and support to the educational program of the institution. The collection should meet the full curricular needs of undergraduate students and should be easily accessible to them.[16]

A central public catalog of all materials, selected by library staff and college faculty on the basis of curricular needs and independent study, and extended library hours are all evidence of the desire to maintain high standards.

The library staff has grown in proportion to need. Today thirty-two professional staff members work in both service and instruction. These faculty members are backed by fourteen civil service clerks, five graduate assistants, and approximately a hundred student workers. Services are extended primarily to the academic community, but area college students and residents also make use of the collection on many occasions. The library is open to its clientele for about eighty-seven hours per week, with an extension of hours during the last two weeks of each quarter.

Probably no one principle is adhered to more fully than that found in the opening remark under functions of the college library in the Standards: "The college library should be the most important resource of the academic community."[17]

---

[16]Guy R. Lyle, The President, the Professor and the College Librarian (New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1963), p. 80.

[17]Ibid., p. 76.

CHAPTER III

SURVEY OF THE RESERVE SYSTEM

The original study of the closed reserve system at St. Cloud State was made following the fall quarter, 1960. In order to achieve some degree of consistency in the overall study of the system, it seemed imperative that a long range comparison be made with some fall quarter at a later date. The fall quarter of 1966 was selected for this reason, but in order to provide a further basis for comparison, on a year-to-year basis, the fall quarter of 1967 was also included. Rather than limit the study entirely to fall quarters, the spring quarter of 1967 was included to provide a comparison within an academic year.

There has been little change in the operation of the reserve system since its inception in 1960. The books are kept in the reserve room, arranged in order by Dewey number, and checked out via call slips. A list of the reserve books is posted on the bulletin board near the reserve room. All statistics and charge-out records were obtained from records kept in the reserve room. Since the original study contained an appendix of facsimile forms, none are included here since they would add little to the study itself. All statistics pertaining to course instructors, number of students, and number of faculty were obtained from the Bureau of Research at the College.

All three quarters were surveyed from three viewpoints; namely, (a) faculty participation, (b) usage, and (c) cost. The following report shall be divided into those three sections. Before

exploring the usage and cost areas, it seems important that the area of faculty participation be explored. A look at this area may well provide an insight into the other two, for not only may these statements reflect upon usage statistics, but they may also reveal the value placed upon the reserve system by instructors.

I. THE INSTRUCTOR AND THE RESERVE SYSTEM

The library adheres to a tight schedule in order to provide some degree of uniformity to the reserve system. Generally the notices for the forthcoming quarter are sent out during the ninth week of the quarter in session and are due back at the end of the eleventh week. The twelfth week is used to type lists and to place the books in the reserve area. During short quarters, the procedure is changed accordingly. Reserve lists for fall quarter are due on the Wednesday of the week previous to regularly scheduled classes.

All faculty members, old or new, are sent notices as soon as their identity can be established. During the orientation period within the first week of school, recent additions to the faculty are informed of the reserve procedure and of the deadline for placing books on reserve. In spite of communication problems, it cannot be said that faculty members are not aware of the reserve collection and its deadlines.

An analysis of faculty use of the reserve system is enlightening. Despite the high value that is often placed on the use of reserve books, Table I on page 15 points out that a very small percentage of the total college faculty uses reserve books

as teaching tools. In 1960, 49 of 190 instructors had books on reserve; this represented 25.6 per cent of the faculty. The number of faculty users has not exceeded this percentage appreciably in any one year since that time, and the percentage will generally reflect a decrease. During the winter quarter, 1968, only 81 of 454 faculty members--17.9 per cent--used the reserve shelf.

This decrease may be indicative of two things. First, fewer instructors are using reserve books in teaching and there is a trend away from this type of reading. Second, the decrease in the number of faculty users may indicate that those who use reserve books do so more effectively in promoting reading. With the small increase in usage that is reflected in Table VII of page 25, it would seem that the former is more likely true.

The percentage of first-year faculty members using the reserve system remains fairly consistent. In the fall of 1960, 3 of 49 faculty members using the reserve shelf were first-year faculty members. This is 5.1 per cent of the users. In the fall of 1967, 61 of 454, or about 13.4 per cent of the faculty users were first-year faculty members. It is interesting to note that this percentage had increased to 17.8 per cent for the winter quarter, 1968--the same academic year. Whether this indicates peer pressure or greater use is open to speculation, but if reserve usage constitutes a valid criterion for judgements the small increase reflected over a six year period hardly indicates more increased use. It is quite possible that the increase is due to peer pressure; it may even be possible that the use of the reserve collection may be seen as a means to achieve status.

TABLE I

RELATION OF FACULTY, RESERVE LISTS, AND FIRST-YEAR USERS

Quarter	Total faculty	Total lists on reserve	Percent of faculty using reserve	First-year Instructors using reserve
Fall 1960	190	49	25.6	3
Fall 1961	197	43	21.8	1
Fall 1962	227	47	20.7	4
Fall 1963	248	60	28.0	10
Fall 1964	264	54	20.4	8
Fall 1965	324	65	20.0	11
Fall 1966	412	60	14.5	15
Spring 1967	412	61	14.8	15
Fall 1967	454	61	13.4	13
Winter 1968	454	81	17.9	16

Another item of interest about faculty use of the reserve collection is the inadequacy on the part of the faculty in adhering to the library schedule of reserve procedures. Circumvention of the rules is apparent in both using reserve materials and in placing these materials on reserve. A random check of several years indicates that during fall quarter, 1962, twenty-seven faculty members of the total forty-seven who used the reserve shelf turned in late lists; of the fifty-four users during the fall quarter, 1964, twenty-three turned in late lists; and of the sixty faculty users during fall quarter, 1966, twenty turned in late lists. Despite a stress on promptness and a threat of exclusion from the reserve system, faculty members do not place enough emphasis on the use of reserve books to turn lists in on time. Likewise, the reserve librarian is often approached by individual students or faculty members who want an extension of the loan time.[18] Often these same books are on other reserve lists and it is difficult to see justification removing the books from the shelf at the expense of other users.

Reserve material requested by faculty members comes in varying amounts and formats, and this has been a constant concern for the reserve librarian. The largest list of reserve books in 1960 contained 447 titles and 587 copies.[19] This type of request, as pointed out by Opgrand, is a serious misuse of the reserve procedure

---

[18]Interview with Charles Campbell, Supervisor, Public Services, Bureau of Learning Resources, St. Cloud State College, February 2, 1968.

[19]Opgrand, Op. cit., p. 12.

(61 per cent of unused books during the fall quarter, 1960, came from that particular list) and should be discouraged.[20] This type of misuse still occurs and necessitates continuous discouragement on the part of the reserve librarian. It seems to indicate that some faculty reserve users have difficulty in distinguishing between reserve books and reading lists.

Despite the effort to orient instructors to differences between reading lists and reserve lists, they insist on submitting this type of list. During the fall quarter, 1966, 18 lists of more than 20 titles were submitted. These lists contained 257 unused titles, or 74.2 per cent of the reserved titles for that quarter. After a determined effort on the part of the reserve librarian, this number was reduced to 13 during the fall quarter, 1967. Even so, 44.8 per cent of the unused titles came from those lists.

Tables II and III on pages 18 and 19 show comparisons of students, titles, and copies for lists of over twenty titles for two quarters. In 18 of the 31 lists the number of copies on reserve far exceeded the number of students in courses taught by those instructors; in fact, in 10 instances, the number of titles exceeded the number of students. In both tables, instructor J is the same person and it seems hardly feasible that the number of copies on reserve should more than double the number of students.

The statistics of Table IV, page 20, show the relationship of students, titles, and copies per college school. The ratio is

---

[20] Ibid.

TABLE II

RELATION OF INSTRUCTOR, NUMBER OF STUDENTS, NUMBER OF TITLES ON RESERVE, NUMBER OF COPIES ON RESERVE, AND NUMBER OF TITLES NOT USED ON RESERVE LISTS OF OVER TWENTY TITLES FOR FALL QUARTER, 1966

Instructor	Number of students	Number of titles	Number of copies	Number of titles not used
A	90	46	132	11
B	11	21	37	11
C	67	27	63	23
D	28	35	51	16
E	63	59	92	7
F	20	39	63	29
G	99	22	28	7
H	41	24	66	9
I	68	68	157	13
J	84	79	197	15
K	101	21	35	3
L	29	32	44	2
M	78	49	117	14
N	67	25	33	1
O	27	63	160	54
P	48	20	26	9
Q	101	35	42	16
R	155	21	34	12

TABLE III

RELATION OF INSTRUCTOR, NUMBER OF STUDENTS, NUMBER OF TITLES ON RESERVE, NUMBER OF COPIES ON RESERVE, AND NUMBER OF TITLES NOT USED ON RESERVE LISTS OF OVER TWENTY TITLES FOR FALL QUARTER, 1967

Instructor	Number of students	Number of titles	Number of copies	Number of titles not used
A	105	22	79	1
B	41	47	127	12
C	10	21	21	14
D	66	43	74	32
E	50	36	91	1
F	40	25	32	3
G	27	21	44	3
H	13	26	48	9
I	125	25	32	3
J	87	93	214	20
K	14	26	60	12
L	84	24	33	14
M	36	33	27	0

TABLE IV

THE RELATIONSHIP OF RESERVE REQUESTS BY SCHOOL AS COMPARED TO THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS VERSUS THE NUMBER OF TITLES AND COPIES

School	Number of students in course	Titles on reserve	Copies on reserve
	Fall 1966		
A	1335	535	972
B	143	27	75
C	1774	370	811
D	135	75	115
	Spring 1967		
A	1480	727	1166
B	261	35	95
C	1810	457	1203
D	17	5	5
	Fall 1967		
A	1688	345	567
B	318	45	119
C	1230	370	886
D	178	53	67

somewhat consistent from year to year, but the concentrated effort during the fall of 1967 to reduce the extensive reserve lists is quite evident.

II. STUDENT USE OF RESERVE

A significant change in reserve system procedure since 1960 prohibits overnight charges. Table V on page 22 shows comparative statistics for morning, afternoon and evening charges during various days of the fall quarter, 1966. Tuesdays and Thursdays received the heaviest morning usage; Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday received the heaviest afternoon usage; and Tuesday received the heaviest evening usage.

One of the reasons for this would be the schedule of float hours. Float hours are periods when classes are not in session and they may well explain heavy usage at certain times on certain days. A schedule of float hours is shown in Table VI on page 23 and a comparison of this schedule with Table V shows why Tuesday and Thursday mornings receive heavy usage for example; likewise, Wednesday afternoon receives the heaviest afternoon usage since an afternoon float hour is scheduled for that time. The number of charges for Wednesday evening is reduced since this is generally considered to be the "night out" for the college student.

A further analysis of Table VI shows that Tuesday is the day of heaviest usage, that afternoons account for almost one-half of all usage, and that Saturday and Sunday usage is the lightest. In the original study, Opgrand concluded that the reduction in Friday and Saturday usage may well have been attributed to the fact that the

TABLE V

COMPARISON OF MORNING, AFTERNOON, AND EVENING
RESERVE CHARGES, FALL QUARTER, 1966

Days of the week	7:45 - 12:00 A.M.	12:01 - 6:00 P.M.	6:01 - 10:00 P.M.	TOTALS
Monday	572	1,113	761	2,446
Tuesday	764	1,151	814	2,729
Wednesday	541	1,189	622	2,352
Thursday	636	918	689	2,243
Friday	493	886		1,379
Saturday	298	436		734
Sunday		484	373	857
TOTALS	3,304	6,177	3,259	12,740

TABLE VI

SCHEDULE OF FLOAT HOURS AT
ST. CLOUD STATE COLLEGE

Day	8:00	9:00	10:00	11:00	12:00	1:00	2:00	3:00	4:00
MONDAY					X	X			
TUESDAY			X	X					
WEDNESDAY							X		
THURSDAY	X	X							
FRIDAY								X	X

materials were available for overnight checkout.[21] The fact that the weekend loan privilege is no longer in effect results in a situation where there seems to have been little change in the number of charges because of the change in procedure. The number of weekend charges is somewhat higher than in 1960, but not significantly so.

Table VI would seem to indicate that although reserve use is less intensive over the weekend than during the week, usage is sufficiently heavy to prohibit overnight and weekend circulation.

The purpose of the reserve shelf is generally said to provide access to limited materials. Reserving unused materials, therefore, is detrimental to the aims of the library. Opgrand pointed this out in his study, and it certainly is a reasonable assumption. In order to keep the reserve collection within the bounds of usefulness, "deadwood" must be eliminated.[22] An analysis of statistics in Table VII on page 25 will indicate that much "deadwood" still makes up the reserve collection at St. Cloud State.

For purposes of evaluation, the same criteria used by Opgrand are applied here. This means that six charges is used as a criterion for determining whether a title is justified in being on reserve. This seems to be a legitimate criterion, since such little usage could be easily accomodated by the regular two-week circulation procedure. Using eleven charges as a minimum would very likely be a bit more realistic. It is quite conceivable, however, that if an instructor would encourage prompt return, any title used less than

---

[21] Opgrand, op. cit., p. 18.

[22] Ibid.

TABLE VII

SUMMARY OF RESERVE USAGE

	Fall 1966		Spring 1967		Fall 1967	
	number	percentage	number	percentage	number	percentage
Titles not used	346	34.5	419	34.6	277	33.4
Titles used 1-5 times	302	30.1	410	33.9	266	32.1
Titles used 6-10 times	121	12.0	132	10.0	89	10.8
Titles used 11-15 times	67	6.6	71	5.9	45	5.4
Titles used 16-20 times	44	4.3	32	2.6	39	4.7
Titles used 21 or more times	126	12.5	147	12.1	113	13.6
TOTALS	1,006	100.0	1,211	100.0	829	100.0

eleven times could be adequately circulated via the regular system.

Keeping the foregoing criteria in mind, an analysis of Table VII indicates that for the fall quarter, 1966, 64.6 per cent of the titles on reserve were used less than 6 times, and 76.6 per cent were used less than 11 times. A total of 34.5 per cent of the titles were not used at all. Looking at this in a positive way, 23.4 per cent of the titles were used 11 times or more. Whichever way this is viewed, there is a lot of "deadwood." An analysis of statistics in Table VII for the spring and fall quarters of 1967 does not present a better picture. During the spring quarter, 1967, 34.6 per cent of the titles were not used, 68.5 per cent were used fewer than 6 times, and 78.5 per cent were used fewer than 11 times. During the fall quarter, 1967, the improvement was small, for 33.4 per cent of the titles were not used, 65.5 per cent were used less than 6 times, and 77.3 per cent were used less than 11 times.

Tables VIII, IX, and X on pages 28, 29, and 30 indicate courses where individual charges exceeded 100. During the fall quarter, 1966, only course D exceeded 7 titles; during the spring quarter, 1967, 5 courses exceeded 8 titles; during fall quarter, 1968, 2 courses exceeded 6 titles. Generally the courses listed here reflect good reserve usage; exceptions are course D in Table VIII, and courses A, D, G, H, and J in Table IX. In these instances the number of charges per copy is relatively low, and an examination of these particular reserve lists reveals that in most cases one title reflected the majority of the charges. There are many unused titles on these lists. The largest number of charges per student (D in

in Table VIII and J in Table IX) are for the same instructor. Although the number of charges per student is high, the number of copies on this instructor's reserve list indicated charges of 3 and 6 for the respective tables. This is not good reserve usage and indicates that the lists contain many books that are used infrequently.

An interesting pattern forms upon examination of some of the reserve lists included in Table II and III on pages 18 and 19. These show two quarters' reserve lists which contained over 20 titles. A typical list representing poor reserve usage would be instructor O's list in which 54 of the 63 titles were not used at all. The reserve collection contained 160 copies placed there by that instructor. Those 160 copies received a total of 30 charges; the instructor had an enrollment of 27 for his class. As opposed to this type of poor reserve usage, it must be pointed out that instructor N's 67 students made excellent use of the 33 titles on reserve. For only seven titles was the number of charges less than 11 and only 1 book went unused.

Unfortunately, examination of the tables and the lists reveals that many more lists are similar to the former than are to the latter in the preceding paragraph. A cursory look at the reserve lists and student use for any quarter shows that generally less than a dozen lists are truly good reserve lists that reflect good usage. Many lists contain one or two books that merit being on reserve; many others do not include a single book belonging on the reserve shelf.

TABLE VIII

COMPARISON BY COURSE OF ALL CHARGES OVER 100
FALL QUARTER, 1966

Course	Students in course	Charges over 100	Titles and copies	Total charges	Maximum charges	Average charges per student
A	44	1	1-1	310	310	7.05
B	36	1	1-7	140	140	3.9
C	91	1	1-1	110	110	1.2
D	32	1	14-86	257	152	8.0
E	66	1	1-1	155	155	2.35

TABLE IX

COMPARISON BY COURSE OF ALL CHARGES OVER 100
SPRING QUARTER, 1967

Course	Students in course	Charges over 100	Titles and copies	Total charges	Maximum charges	Average charges per student
A	42	1	43-85	154	100	3.62
B	71	1	5-21	188	100	2.65
C	141	1	10-10	407	111	2.88
D	41	1	10-27	170	166	4.14
E	31	1	1-7	170	170	5.48
F	73	1	1-3	187	132	2.56
G	113	1	8-32	267	170	2.36
H	117	1	36-105	245	166	2.09
I	81	1	2-2	224	223	2.76
J	42	2	14-86	486	170	11.6

TABLE X

COMPARISON BY COURSE OF ALL CHARGES OVER 100
FALL QUARTER, 1967

Course	Students in course	Charges over 100	Titles and copies	Total charges	Maximum charges	Average charges per student
A	105	1	10-14	509	116	5.0
B	72	2	5-14	375	121	5.28
C	79	2	6-27	303	117	3.82
D	141	1	2-4	107	105	.76
E	38	1	1-7	141	141	3.71
F	72	1	1-6	112	112	1.55
G	142	1	10-29	419	276	2.95
H	107	1	2-6	352	346	3.29

III. COST ANALYSIS OF THE RESERVE SYSTEM

The phase of the study that dealt with the cost analysis of the reserve system has been accomplished in several ways. Two sample reserve lists (see Appendix A and B) from two different instructors were used, and both lists were fairly typical of those submitted by instructors on the college staff.

The lists were verified according to author, title, copyright, and number of copies, and then typed. The books were sent through the entire reserve procedure--placed in the reserve collection, withdrawn, and then returned to the circulation shelves. All procedures were executed and each step was timed. Times for each step of the two sample reserve lists were averaged to provide a per title and per list cost as needed.

An estimate of supervisory time was established by consultation with the reserve librarian; this was added to time consumed by the clerical and student help to produce a total number of man hours. The summary of man hours shown in Appendix C should be realistic. If an estimate was necessary, it was conservative; and based on empirical observation, the times should be considered minimum rather than maximum. Costs for materials and any other costs were determined by consulting catalogs and invoices. A summary of cost rates is contained in Appendix D.

Tables XI and XII on pages 32 and 33, showing man-hour costs and supply costs, are self explanatory. Adding these costs together, the total reserve cost for the fall quarter, 1966, was $1,498.74;

TABLE XI

MAN-HOUR COST PER QUARTER

Description of Work	Type of Work	Fall 1966	Fall 1967	Winter 1968
Type stencil and duplicate	Clerical	2.05	2.05	2.05
Prepare faculty notices	Clerical	5.04	5.04	5.04
Verify titles, call numbers, etc.	Clerical	46.83	38.60	60.87
Type lists	Clerical	35.21	29.02	45.75
Pull books and file cards	Student	14.25	11.74	20.69
Pasting and reserve shelving	Student	23.78	19.60	34.56
Hunting for snags	Student	7.65	7.78	11.55
Pulling from reserve, slipping, and re-shelving in circulation	Student	22.75	18.75	33.04
Student desk time	Student	975.00	1,069.00*	1,206.35**
Supervisory time	Professional	325.00	325.00	325.00
	TOTALS	1,457.56	1,506.58	1,744.90

* Library Hours Expanded
** Student Wages increased
NOTE: There will be another added increase in the hourly rate of pay for student assistants

TABLE XII

SUPPLY COST PER QUARTER

Item	Number Used	Fall 1966	Fall 1967	Winter 1968
Blue mimeo paper	1 per faculty member	1.20	1.32	1.32
Stencil	1 per quarter	.09	.09	.09
Bond paper	1 per page per list	.42	.32	.52
Carbon paper	20 per quarter	.85	.85	.85
Onion Skin paper	4 per page per list	2.29	1.72	2.86
Pink reserve slips	1 per book copy	5.91	4.92	6.93
Blue check-out cards	Varies with use	27.00	27.00	27.00
Record cards	1 per title	3.42	2.82	4.44
	TOTALS	41.18	39.04	44.01

for the fall quarter, 1967, the total reserve cost was $1,545.62; and for the winter quarter, 1968, the total reserve cost was $1,788.91. The cost for the winter quarter, 1968, reflects an increase because of an increase in student wages, but it cannot be discounted that there is a trend toward increased costs. Projecting the cost of the fall quarter, 1967, and the winter quarter, 1968, through the spring and summer sessions of 1968 gives us an estimated annual operational cost of about $8,700.00.

The costs as given in the preceding paragraph may well be just a small part of the entire operational budget of the library, but if this money could be used for additional copies or additional materials, the reserve system could be eliminated or reduced.

The picture of reserve cost becomes somewhat more clear when the costs are projected per title. Dividing the cost for the fall quarter, 1966, by the number of titles on reserve gives us a cost of $1.49 per title. Using the same procedure, the cost per title for the fall quarter, 1967, was $1.75. Using these two costs as samples, the average estimated cost per title would be $1.62. This appears to be a high premium to pay for the prestige of having a reserve collection when the per cent of titles receiving less than eleven charges hovers at approximately 75 per cent.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Differences in factors surrounding the reserve system at St. Cloud State have been pointed out in Chapter II. The college has changed greatly, library organization has changed considerably, there has been a rapid growth in staff. Whatever effect these changes may have had on the reserve system is not easy to determine, but it is not unreasonable to assume that with growth come greater communication problems.

Generally few things have changed in the reserve procedure itself. Most changes represent an attempt to improve communication between faculty members and the library with the prime purpose of improving the use of reserve materials. Reserve procedures, both in placing materials on reserve and in using materials, have remained static.

Hours have changed considerably in that they have been extended. Whereas the library was closed on Sundays in 1960, it is now open from 2:00 to 11:00. The closing time for week days has also been extended from 9:00 to 11:00.

This follow-up study has revealed a similiarity in present faculty use of the reserve collection to that in the 1960 study. Despite few changes in reserve procedure, the number of faculty members who submit late lists remained fairly constant during the years. This number averages out to about one-third of the reserve users.

The proportion of faculty members using the reserve shelf has decreased since the original study. Whereas 25.6 per cent of the faculty used the reserve during the fall quarter, 1960, this number has been reduced by 10 per cent for the quarters considered in this study. The number of first-year faculty users has remained fairly constant.

The extremely long reserve list encountered by Opgrand has not reappeared. No list resembles in length the 485 titles submitted by an instructor during the fall quarter, 1960, but lists of from 70 to 100 books are still being submitted. The number of students who are to use this list is often less than the number of copies on reserve. The number of reserve lists with more than 20 titles has not been reduced appreciably. In 1960 there were 12 such lists and during the fall quarter, 1967, there were 13. The average number of lists with over twenty titles does not represent a statistical decrease when the present study is compared to the original study. It is interesting to note that just as the majority of the unused or little used titles came from extensive lists in 1960, so also did the majority come from extensive lists in the present study.

Student use of reserve books reflects a slight increase when comparing the two studies. The quarters used in the present study reflect a decrease of about 2 or 3 per cent in the number of titles not used. The same kind of decrease is noted for the books with charges of from 1 to 5 times. As we move to the books with heaviest usage, this same kind of increase is reflected. The small percentage of change seems to have shifted so that about a 2 to 3 per cent increase in use is shown.

There has been little change in the times when students use reserve books. Afternoons show the heaviest usage both in the 1960 study and in the present study. Float periods still play a part in the use of reserve and, although weekend usage is light, it is extensive enough to merit hours on the weekends.

Since no cost analysis was made in 1960 a comparison cannot be made. It is obvious that this cost is not decreasing and that it will very likely continue to increase. A general observation is that the operational cost of the reserve collection is extremely high, and the estimated $8,700.00 spent in one year should be carefully scrutinized and evaluated.

In conclusion, it is necessary to return to the basic hypothesis. The hypothesis stated that improvement in the reserve system, based on findings of the 1960 study, has resulted in increased use of the reserve collection. This statement is true when analyzed on a usage basis. The increase is, however, so slight that it is hardly indicative of anything except a misunderstanding on the part of the college faculty as to the function of the reserve system.

The second part of the hypothesis stated in effect that the reserve system should be discontinued, and that if the funds that are used in its operation were directed to providing additional materials, the library could provide improved service because of fewer restrictions on materials.

This hypothesis is basically sound. The elimination of closed reserve could be accomplished in several ways, with the first step being the elimination of unused or little used material. Using the

fall quarter, 1967, as an example, 73.6 per cent of the titles would fall into this category.

A second step would be to provide enough material for adequate service of the remaining 23.7 per cent of the titles. These could be handled in a variety of ways, all of which would eliminate the closed reserve completely and yet be less expensive. One way might be to leave the books on the open shelves, but restrict their use to a given period of time by using color cards in them. Another way might be to purchase additional copies to meet the demand. This would not necessarily be a recommended procedure but after the original investment the cost would be relatively small. Many of these purchases could be in the form of paperbacks, thus reducing the cost even more.

Students should share in the cost of materials used by instructors in reserve readings as these are extensions of the textbooks. Many of these materials could be reproduced for use in class.

Probably the most effective way of eliminating the reserve system, and very likely the method that most educators would be prone to promote, is to provide the students with expanded reading lists. This would encourage not only more widespread reading but also a greater variety of views about a particular subject. Librarians would prefer simply a system where students learn to search for their own materials with whatever guidance might be necessary from the library staff; this helps students to become independent learners.

Money spent for operational costs for the reserve collection would provide a great deal of additional resource material that would substitute for the reserve system.

The findings of this survey are realistic to most librarians, for this system is typical of other systems throughout the nation. This experience is described by Benjamin Smith:

> . . . students learn best when classroom instruction is library oriented rather than textbook oriented . . . . To this end, well-balanced collections have been assembled to supplement and to complement classroom instruction. The college library, however, is handicapped in fulfilling this educational mission by the burden of a system of reserve books, which represent an extension of the textbook. The function of the librarian under such a system becomes nothing more than that of keeping the room in order so that authors and titles can be correctly read.[23]

This statement sums up the role of the librarian in the educational process as well as his role as a librarian. Librarians want to help because it provides the type of learning that is desirable and lasting. The reserve shelf is not conducive to this type of learning, nor is the cost of the reserve procedure a wise expenditure of funds. The college instructor can help most if he but heeds the words of E. J. Josey:

> "There is still a crying need for college professors to select a list which would include a wide variety of readings that would not confine their students to a limited number of authorities in the field. The suggested reading list for college courses should not be shallow or superficial. Instead, the reading list should have depth and be broad enough to include the writings of authorities from several schools of thought."[24]

---

[23]Benjamin F. Smith, "The Book Reserve System," Improving College and University Teaching, XII (Spring, 1964), p. 86.

[24]E. J. Josey, "The Absent Professors," Library Journal, LXXXVII (January 15, 1962), p. 174.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Library Association. College and University Library Service. Chicago: American Library Association, 1938.

Beach, Robert F. "Some Useful Techniques in the Reserve Book Room," American Library Association Bulletin, XXXIII, (October, 1954), pp. 185-7.

"College Profile: St. Cloud State College, 1966-67." St. Cloud: St. Cloud State College, Information Services, 1967.

Carroll, Leontine D. "Students Don't Need the Library," Improving College and University Teaching, XII (Spring, 1964), pp. 81-2.

Hagerty, Martha. "The Reserve Book System: A Positive View," Wilson Library Bulletin, XXIV (January, 1952), pp. 387-88+.

Josey, E. J. "Absent Professors," Library Journal, LXXXVII (January 15, 1962), pp. 173-5+.

Lansberg, William R. "Current Trends in the College Reserve Room," College and Research Libraries, XI (April, 1950), pp. 120-24+.

Lyle, Guy R. The Administration of the College Library. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1961.

_____. The President, the Professor, and the College Library. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1963.

Opgrand, Harold J. "An Evaluation of the Closed Reserve at St. Cloud State College." Unpublished starred paper, The University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1960.

Ritter, R. Vernon. "Recorded Library Use in Small Four-Year Colleges, 1962-1963," College and Research Libraries, XXV (September, 1964), pp. 391-92.

St. Cloud State College General Bulletin, 1967-69. St. Cloud: St. Cloud State College, 1967.

Shepherd, G. F., Jr. "Methods and Procedures," Library Trends, VI (July, 1957), pp. 20-7.

Smith, Benjamin F. "The Book Reserve System," Improving College and University Teaching, XII (Spring, 1964), pp. 83-6.

Smith, Paul M., Jr. "Required Reading," Education, LXXIX (November, 1958), pp. 172-74.

"Summary Report to the President," St. Cloud: Bureau of Instructional Resources, 1967. (Multilithed.)

Works, George Allen. College and University Library Problems. Chicago: American Library Association, 1927.

Wriston, Henry M. Academic Procession: Reflections of a College President. New York: Columbia University, 1959, pp. 135-140.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

RESERVE

FACULTY MEMBER A
Fall 1965

Political Science 487-587

328.73
B43o Bendiner: OBSTACLE COURSE ON CAPITAL HILL 1964. (1)

328.73
B63h Bolling: HOUSE OUT OF ORDER 1965. (1)

328.73
C54c Clark; CONGRESS; THE SAPLESS BRANCH 1964. (1)

328.73
G91ℓ Gross: THE LEGISLATIVE STRUGGLE 1953. (1)

328.73
K24a Keefe: AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE PROCESS 1964. (1)

328.73
M23f MacNeil: FORGE OF DEMOCRACY 1963. (1)

328.73
M61m Miller: MEMBER OF THE HOUSE 1962. (1)

328.73
P31n Peabody: NEW PERSPECTIVES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 1963. (1)

328.73
R56h Robinson: THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE 1963. (1)

328.73
W58c White: CITADEL (U.S. Senate) 1957. (1)

FACULTY MEMBER A
Fall 1965

APPENDIX B

RESERVE

FACULTY MEMBER B
I SS 1961

English 443

810.9 B81a 1909	Brownell: AMERICAN PROSE MASTERS 1909. (1)
920 C16c	Canby: CLASSIC AMERICANS 1931. (1)
921 F854f	Fay: FRANKLIN. THE APOSTLE OF MODERN TIMES 1929. (1)
921 F854f1	Fisher: TRUE BENJAMIN FRANKLIN 1926. (1)
R.B. 921 F854m	McMaster: BENJAMIN FRANKLIN AS A MAN OF LETTERS 1887.
921 F854r	Russell: BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, THE FIRST CIVILIZED AMERICAN. 1926. (1)
921 F854v	Vandoren: BENJAMIN FRANKLIN 1938. (2)
921 H318w	Woodberry: NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE 1902. (1)

FACULTY MEMBER B
I SS 1961

APPENDIX C

MAN-HOURS FOR RESERVE PROCEDURE DETERMINED BY SAMPLE LISTS*

	8-title list	10-title list	list Average
Searching for titles, numbers, etc.	9 min.	15 min.	12 min. clerical
Typing of reserve list	10 min.	8 min.	9 min. clerical
Pulling books from shelve and filing cards	7 min.	8 min.	7 1/2 min. student
Pasting pink slips and shelving in reserve	12 min.	13 min.	12 1/2 min. student
Hunting for books not on shelve	6 min.	9 min.	7 1/2 min. student
Pulling books from reserve shelf, filing cards, and re-shelving in general collection	12 min.	12 min.	12 min. student
Supervisory time for complete list (estimate)			50 hrs. professional
Student desk time			87 1/4 hrs. per week plus 14 hrs. on Fridays of two weeks preceding finals

* The 8-title and 10-title reserve lists used as sample lists were actually submitted by instructors.

APPENDIX D

COSTS FOR MATERIALS AND LABOR

I. Materials

A.	Blue Mimeo Paper	$ 1.45 per 500
B.	Stencil	.09 each
C.	Bond Paper	2.00 per 500
D.	Carbon Paper	4.25 per 100
E.	Onion Skin Paper	2.75 per 500
F.	Pink Reserve Slips	3.00 per 1000
G.	Blue Check-out Cards	3.40 per 1000
H.	Record Cards	3.40 per 1000

II. Labor (Clerical and student)

A.	Typing stencil and duplicating	2.05 per hour
B.	Preparing notices per faculty	1.68 per hour
C.	Searching for titles and call numbers	2.05 per hour
D.	Typing of lists	2.05 per hour
E.	Pulling books and filing cards	*1.00 per hour
F.	Posting and shelving in reserve	*1.00 per hour
G.	Hunting for snags	*1.00 per hour
H.	Pulling from reserve	*1.00 per hour
I.	Slipping and reshelving	*1.00 per hour
J.	Student desk time	*1.00 per hour

* Student salary increased to $1.15 in 1968.

III. Professional Supervisory Time $325.00 per quarter